20c JANUARY 19, 1953

SANDBURG'S YOUNG DAYS—page 18

New Republic

THE THREAT TO EDUCATION

- **McCARTHY'S NEWEST TARGET**
  an Editorial
- **ANTI-INTELLECTUALISM:**
  Where the Schools Themselves Fail
  by Arthur E. Bestor
- **TEACHERS UNDER FIRE**
  by Broadus Mitchell

The Charles C. Sherrod Library
EAST TENNESSEE STATE COLLEGE
Johnson City, Tennessee

JAN 15 1953

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Letters

What Are You Going to Do About It?

What are we going to do, the Stevenson supporters, from now on? We've heard more from San Antonio than from any city in America since November 4. So we asked Maury Maverick to start off a series of answers by NR readers. We hope others will follow his lead.

● What are you going to do about it?—When I was a kid that was the title of hundreds of articles written by our sensible writers or do-gooders or muckrakers or damned radicals, depending on your point of view.

Do about it? We are meeting together here in San Antonio and Southwest Texas, down South, the deep dark South, according to my Northern liberal friends (the sooner people get in their minds that the South is like anywhere else the better for all of us).

At our last meeting we had 300 people. There were no richercrats in the crowd, no intellegentsia, just people called ignorant but who are educated by reading. I said when I began my speech that the most ignorant people in America are the educated and the best educated are the ignorant.

We had a head table; a Mexican supper. $1.25. We keep a quarter for the organization. Sitting with me is Valmo Bellinger, a Negro; and anywhere in the United States where people think we're going to win either as Democrats or as Americans with second-class citizens is wrong, crazy, cracked and out of their minds. Bellinger made me nervous and irritated me. Race, creed or color? No, sir. He made a better speech than me.

As Jefferson said of the Revolution that displaced Napoleon, the people have to do something for themselves. They had forgotten the French Revolution, he told Lafayette, and now they will have to be thinking and doing for themselves.

After this lesson in history, we discussed local affairs and talked of books. Read, we said, the *New Republic,* the *Nation,* the *Manchester Guardian,* the *New Statesman and Nation* of London. Who wants a subscription to the *New Republic?* We have sold 75 here in San Antonio. A young lady named Wanda Ford sold them. "Speeches of Stevenson" book, sold by Mrs. Kathleen Voight. Sales 150. I promote "The Big Change" by Frederick Allen which everybody ought to read, and you can't get a copy in Southwest Texas so many have been sold.

When you read a newspaper, read the headline which may be the first lie. Tidelands. Steal. But who does the stealing, and when the federal government starts letting our natural resources get robbed away from the American people, where will it lead to?

Now, this man who wrote the tidelands story used to be a liberal. They starved him out. So now we find that he not only works for the paper, but he is on a certain payroll.

Subscribe to the New York *Times* (claims to be independent) and the New York *Herald Tribune* (Republican, but honest). Even with these papers, however, read with care. Get the *Christian Science Monitor* and the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch.*

Listen to Fulton Lewis Jr. Oh no, groaned the audience. Listen to that sugar-dripping, cotton-mouthed old Kaltenborn. Listen to them both. You've got to know the propaganda of the Republicans; a fair rule is just think the opposite of Kaltenborn. The worst broadcasters are on the National Broadcasting system. Listen to Elmer Davis, he tells the news and is honest.

What about Drew Pearson? I told them a story. Drew is a Quaker. He and his brother Leon say thee and thou at home. I told them how someone had said for me to tell Drew: "When thou returnest to thy mother's kennel I hope she bites thee." No, he isn't what our great leader Truman said he was. Drew has guts. He does right. Listen to Drew, read him.

Truman, my friends, will be known in history as a great man, a good man. Who is there here who will say that Lincoln is not a great man? Our Southern grandparents and millions of sanctimonious Yankees did not think so. Now nearly 100 years later we know that Lincoln was a great man. Some people are so dumb it will take them that long to find out about Roosevelt.

And who at night rides flaming by in a chariot? Franklin D. Roosevelt. Joan of Arc said: "I did see angels, worshipful sirs. They had long silver trumpets, in the sky my Lord Bishop, I heard the shrill cry of the trumpets; they commanded me that I must save France."

A witch, shouted the Bishop, she shall be burned at the stake.

There *were* angels and there *were* long silver trumpets, my friends. Joan of Arc saw them. And if you will only look in the sky at the night you will see them. You will see a great cavalcade led by FDR in a flowing cape.

Alphabetical agencies, his enemies spat. Yes, indeed. Coolidge, Harding, all of them wanted to give those Southern states away. Give Muscle Shoals away. Give them all with their phosphates, water, air, light, human and natural resources, give them all away to Henry Ford.

Oh, yes. But what would we Democrats do? Old man Norris stood on the hill over Muscle Shoals while FDR was in a car. The tears streamed and ran hot down his cheeks. He said, "Only Roosevelt would have done this. And now all these states will be developed and human beings will be better." We all stood there mute and silent and we knew that humanity had marched ahead. And we looked at Old Man Norris' tears, and we wept, too.

This Communist nonsense. Anybody who calls you that, kick their faces in! Beat their brains out! We are patriots! We are Americans! It is our Flag; and at Boston and everywhere in all the rest of the places it was us. Not them, but us.

Our feet were bloody at Valley Forge. *We* marched in darkness in the Argonne. *We* kept going. *We* fought the Japanese in the Solomon Islands. *We* attacked North Africa. *We* got shot to pieces at Salerno. *We* marched in on the Omaha beachhead.

(Continued on page 4)

Bandwagon

Not That Old Track!

Senator Taft summed up the results of the luncheon meeting (with Eisenhower) as follows: "I feel very confident there will be no difficulty working out . . . a Republican legislative program that will be progressive and will put the country back on the track that we abandoned 20 years ago when the New Deal came in."—*From the New York* Herald Tribune.

Real or Red Estate

Residents of Spring Valley came out in force . . . to bar erection of a new Sibley Hospital on American University campus. . . . Harrison Somerville, head of a plumbing company, said, "I face a 50-percent loss on my property if the hospital is built. The idea is more like Communism than the American way of life."—*From the Washington, D. C.,* Evening Star.

Business is Booming

Package-designer Alan Berni of Alan Berni & Associates . . . is a specialist in "making packages appear bigger." . . . The "unbranded maverick" of the package-designing profession is Gerald Stahl. . . . "The new package came about as the result of a market study," says Mr. Stahl. "Consumers now pay $1.69 for the new package, which outsells by far the old one, which went for $1.29."—*From the* Wall Street Journal.

Our readers are invited to contribute; $2 will be paid for each item used. Address Bandwagon, c/o New Republic. Please enclose the original clipping. – The Editors.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

New Republic

CONTENTS FOR JAN. 19, 1953

5 The Goose Step, 1953 An Editorial
7 The Week:
7 Spoiling for Housing
7 The Long Road Ahead
7 The Rosenberg Case
8 The Dulles-Eisenhower Plan for Asia
9 Teachers in the Toils, by Broadus Mitchell
11 Anti-Intellectualism in the Schools, by Arthur E. Bestor Jr.
14 VII. Point Four and the Battle for Asia, by Clarence E. Decker
16 The High Cost of Health, by Seymour E. Harris
18 Literature and the Arts:
18 Carl Sandburg, *Always the Young Strangers*, by G. W. Johnson
19 Baron Corvo, *Hadrian VII*, by Donald Sutherland
19 Dickens Under Glass, by Paul Goodman
20 Corliss Lamont, *Soviet Civilization*, by Bruce Bliven
21 I. Mark and E. Schwab, *The Faith of Our Fathers*, by Irving Brant
21 E. Mundt, *Art, Form and Civilization*, by Kermit Lansner
22 Cortez Ewing, *Primary Elections*, by V. O. Key Jr.
22 On Acting, by Eric Bentley

EDITOR, Michael Straight
CHAIRMAN, Editorial Board: Bruce Bliven
PUBLISHER: Daniel Mebane
MANAGING EDITOR: Helen Fuller
LITERARY EDITOR: Robert Richman
REPORTERS: Jean Begeman, Tom Fitzsimmons, Arnold J. Heidenheimer (on leave with the Armed Services)
CONTRIBUTING EDITORS: Eric Bentley, Drama Critic; Malcolm Cowley; Robert Evett, Music Critic.
CONTRIBUTING CRITICS: W. H. Auden, Dudley Fitts, Kimon Friar, Gerald Johnson, V. O. Key, Max Lerner, Richard Lester, James R. Newman, Kathleen Raine, John Crowe Ransom, Herbert Read, Mark Schorer, James Johnson Sweeney, Allen Tate, Robert Penn Warren
ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: F. R. Ruskin
COPY ASSISTANT: Lucille Davis

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1953 IN THE USA BY WESTBURY PUBLICATIONS, INC., PUBLISHING OFFICE 301 N ST., N.E., WASHINGTON 2, D. C. EDITORIAL COMMUNICATIONS SHOULD BE ADDRESSED TO 1416 F ST., N.W., WASHINGTON 4, D.C. BUSINESS COMMUNICATIONS SHOULD BE ADDRESSED TO 40 EAST 49th ST., NEW YORK 17, N. Y. ENTERED AS SECOND-CLASS MATTER SEPTEMBER 26, 1950, AT THE POST OFFICE AT WASHINGTON, D. C., UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879. SINGLE COPY, 20c; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, $6.50; CANADA AND FOREIGN, $7.50.

WASHINGTON WIRE

IKE DELIVERS his Inaugural Address on Tuesday, and no doubt it will be as good as Lincoln's. But whether it be Lincoln or Stanley High, it will cause the 80-Percent Press to reel with delight. We have been toying with the notion that we could write the mass editorial paean of response right now, without waiting, and have composed a few tentative panegyrics that (we consider) are real swooners. We suggest it as a party game for cynics on the eve of the Inaugural Ball while GOP bankers and their ladies dance in the streets of recaptured Washington and rejoice that now it will be safe to wear their mink again.

Actually, we think Ike is getting off to an ominously bad start, and since world leadership is at stake we shudder a bit. As always in Washington, Ike's opponent is Congress; the antagonism is a built-in feature of our archaic Constitution. Now the feudal barons are taking measure of the new king. The tragedy is that Ike could have been elected without the demagoguery that plagues him now. Ike created hopes that the GOP cannot possibly fulfill. Worse, he fed the Old Guard a blood diet that makes them ravening wolves.

Ike indorsed McCarthy: that opened the way for the attack on schools and colleges now starting. Ike promised to return offshore oil to adjacent states: that encourages every sordid state interest to try to grab other conservation treasures. Ike proclaimed a quick budget balance and "more defense for less money" (Troy, N. Y. Oct. 23): this encourages Republican wild men who are willing to gouge out the eyes of defense and slit the throat of foreign aid in their lust for tax cuts. Ike implied a quick solution in Korea; General Bradley now says that if there's a quick way out the General Staff doesn't know it, but Ike is the captive of his own promises. Ike pledged the country "the best brains"; these, it develops, are super-duper business executives with little political savvy—already there has been a flare-up from Taft and a current patronage row with Hill leaders. And, finally, the 80-Percent Press pampered Ike to the point where he half intends now to drop weekly press conferences altogether—one of the most democratic features of Washington life. We have a feeling that even before he takes his oath Ike has planted the seeds of many troubles, troubles that might have been avoided.

Final vignettes crowd Washington. Under the crystal chandeliers of the House committee room the spotlights fall for the last time on immaculate Secretary Acheson, the waxed ends of his brushed, once-brown, Guards' moustache tilting jauntily upward as he turns his handsome, ruddy, aristocratic nose toward his tormentors. They keep him waiting the usual 15 minutes, rosette in lapel, handkerchief in breast pocket, gray four-in-hand tie immaculately smooth, signet ring on his left-hand little finger, ankles crossed under the small, cheap witness table while the flash bulbs snap, then ask him half insolently "if he minds if the photographers take pictures?" He laughs philosophically at his own discomforture. This is the studied ignominy to which Congress subjects any man who is trying to pilot foreign affairs. He is taking his final spanking and his hair has turned iron gray in the years, but his flag is still flying: "If things go wrong we should bear the blame; if things go right we never receive any credit—that is the nature of life," he says philosophically.

Another vignette: Truman is holding his last budget seminar. A week before he gave his superb valedictory message. London hailed him as "this little man with the heart of a lion." Well—what is his place in history? . . . He is smil-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing, relaxed, with the air of a man who is going to start saying "I told you so" soon. He shows remarkable facility in answering technical budget questions; his Secretary of the Treasury and Budget Director sit on either side, but he turns few questions over to them. This is a very tight budget, he says; personally he thinks taxes should be raised, not lowered—the budget balanced out of the booming prosperity. Big fiscal diagrams on tubular aluminum tripods stand behind, one showing yellow cubes, another split circle dollars, another diagramming roller-coaster curves of federal expenditures and receipts. It is good to remember Truman so, not a great man perhaps, yet a man of courage —not one who would go to Wisconsin to make a campaign speech and omit praise for his friend General Marshall because Senator McCarthy sat on the platform.

There is another scene. Incoming Budget Director Dodge, fresh from his Detroit bank and fresh from Japan, comes to his first press conference, crisp, dominating, militant. There are 100 reporters present—and this is the hated city of bureaucrats, and now there is a new businessman's era and Dodge has come to show who is master. He has a two-page mimeographed release of numbered paragraphs, the silly first page confined to saying he is not responsible for the forthcoming Truman Budget. It is sour, sore, ungenerous. At once a frostily polite duel starts. These are not subservient bank employees now or polite Japs, but hawk-like Washington reporters. Dodge is forced back. His rigid demand to follow paragraphs in prescribed order is overthrown. When he declines to pledge a balanced budget even at any time in the next four years, he is reminded of recent GOP campaign promises. The questions are a little rough, but the striped-pants bank-presidential manner is hard to take. Dodge loosens up, thaws, becomes human and placatory. The man who leaves the room is a different being from the one who entered it. The press has begun the process of educating Ike's millionaires.

Washington T.R.B.

CORRESPONDENCE

(Continued from page 2)

We will raise, some of us as much as $5 or $10 a month, but all of us will give a dollar or so (we raised $317). We will have a headquarters. We are not going to depend on the Sheriff, or the County Clerk or the city machine. We will have our own organization. We have a chairman. The Alamo City Democratic League. We have seven or eight organizations of women around and about. We talk seriously. We have found that people who didn't go to school at all read books—a lot more books than the Rotarians, the Kiwanians and the people in the Country Clubs.

Yes, we are talking among ourselves and we are looking ahead. We are not going to stop a minute and all we've got to say to the rest of America is meet in homes two or three of you. Get 30 if you can. If you will sit and talk, we will know that it is our feet that were bloody at Valley Forge. Our feet, not theirs. It was we who were crazy enough to fight each other at Gettysburg and Bull Run. It was we in uniforms of Blue and Gray who burned to death as we lay wounded and as the fire swept the Battle of the Wilderness. It was we who died in the Wilderness. It was we who lost our lives in the Battleship Saratoga as we advanced toward the Solomons, and it was we who talked and thought and wrote books and formed committees of correspondence and made the greatest nation on the face of the earth.

Force? We do not renounce it. But we want peace.

Now we will organize everyone of us, all of us, and hell and all the big newspapers and all the liars and cheats, the smug-mugs, the Kiwanians, Rotarians, the Chambers of Commerce, manufacturers, the country clubbers, or friends who have gotten too fat, shall not prevail against us. Come to order. Report.

Did I not tell you, when I was little, we sang, "Hang John Brown's Body on a Sour Apple Tree" and now we know that this is the *Battle Hymn of the Republic* that beats in our hearts? Sure, and what about your precinct? Tell them we Democrats stand for low interest, high wages—this means turnover, production, purchasing power, rising standard of living. The Republicans: high interest, low wages, capital accumulation to be put in fewer hands to drip down upon us, we dumb obedient ones, and with the dripping, creeping sales taxes, less wages, more burdens. Tell them facts: we are for peace, also civilian government and the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights for all. Next time, report on every precinct. You are cadres of democracy: give them your message. We sing the *Battle Hymn of the Republic:* no sour apple tree, just people, all kinds of people, marching on, our troop is marching on, and nothing will stop us.

Adjourned.

Step up, make separate reports on precincts.

San Antonio, Texas MAURY MAVERICK

Right or Wrong?

● I'd like to express my appreciation of Joseph Frank's criticism in general, and my disagreement with his article on Gide in particular. Mr. Frank is refreshing because he is neither solemn nor trivial. He has none of that pedantic affectation of connoisseurship which makes a premature fuss over trifles, but he always goes straight to the heart of his subject. And he does so with a liveliness and gusto which remind us that literature is of human interest and not the exclusive property of the graduate school. His Waugh review was a pleasure.

But—like so many sensible people—he's wrong about Gide. And for two reasons. First, he seems to feel that Gide's behavior to his wife shows his celebrated "sincerity" to be mere self-indulgence. But since when does a man's behavior invalidate his ideas? Gide's sincerity is also an intellectual thing—like the honesty of the scientist. While his feebler humanity may sometimes have used it for purposes of self-indulgence (what may *not* be used so?), his genius recognized its nobler possibilities and showed them to us. And to us that's all that matters. Besides, we can know enough of what's involved in a work of art or of moral teaching to judge its ideas rightly in their *given* context. But who can be sure of being right in judging a man's behavior, where the situation is at all complicated?

Winter Park, Fla. IRVIN STOCK

The *New Republic* is returning contributions which have been sent in our care for the Stevenson Fund.

The Governor's decision, as has been reported, is to devote the immediate future to study and travel. We think the decision a wise one. Our suggestion for the present is that those to whom funds are returned make the same contribution to help cover the deficit of the campaign. We know this to be Governor Stevenson's wish—that the deficit be covered first before any other fund is raised.

Contributions should be addressed to Mr. Dwight Palmer, treasurer, Democratic National Committee, Ring Building, Washington, D. C. — THE EDITORS.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

VOLUME 128, NUMBER 3, ISSUE 1990, WASHINGTON, D. C., JANUARY 19, 1953

New Republic

THE GOOSE STEP, 1953

THIRTY years ago, in *The Goose Step*, Upton Sinclair tore into our "Academic Department Stores." Our universities, he declared, were "dominated by a vested class which fears ideas and forbids all thinking save what is certified to be harmless." His parody of Nicholas Murray Butler concluded: "We go to college to learn about our ancestors and become as they were—the pitiful victims of blind instinct."

Thirty years of ferment cleared the universities of that indictment. Now it seems as if the twenties may be remembered as years of rich diversity and careless rapture.

Senator McCarthy announces, "We are going into the educational system—exposing Communists and Communist thinkers." Rep. Harold Velde, new chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee, declares that he too is investigating education, "a very fertile field."

If these were isolated inquiries in prosperous years, they might be easily withstood. But they come in lean years for the universities, and they climax mounting pressures, led as the Macmillan Company notes "by certain forces, vicious, well-organized and coldly calculating, that would like to change the face of education."

There is the long drive to curb freedom of inquiry and expression among teachers. Scarsdale, Battle Creek, Pasadena, a hundred peaceful communities bear the scars of vigilantism. Thirty-three states have enacted teacher-loyalty laws. "The law inevitably turns the school into a spying project," concluded Justice William O. Douglas in his Feinberg dissent. "Principals become detectives, the students, the parents and the community become informers."

There is the growing drive against modern methods in education. *"Progressive education is pragmatic!"* Allen Zoll cries; "Progressive education promotes Socialism!" Soon the cry becomes *"Progressive education is subversive!"* Dr. Bella Dodd has testified that Communists are instructed to support progressive education. Therefore progressive education is Communist. The attacks on Dr. Willard Goslin, Superintendent of Schools in Pasadena, began when he invited as lecturer to a summer workshop Dr. William Heard Kilpatrick, member of the John Dewey Society. The Investigating Committee appointed by the California Senate to review Goslin's subsequent dismissal listened to charges that he had substituted a report system for a grading system. It then heard a Mr. Eric Pridonoff testify that when the Communists took power in Yugoslavia "the first thing that occurred was the elimination of the grading system." Mr. Pridonoff continued: "I am not making accusations that our educators pushing progressive education are Communists, but they certainly are making it possible to put through ideas the Communists are after and Sovietize our system." The Senate Committee, in confirming the wisdom of Goslin's dismissal, noted: "There would seem to be some basis for the charge that he planned to continue the program of progressive education in Pasadena."

There is thirdly, the drive to bolt and bar the minds of young Americans to modern ideas by banning liberal and internationalist textbooks and reference books.

The textbooks of Harold Rugg are long since outlawed. Frank Magruder's *American Government* is barred in Georgia's public schools because it "advocates strengthening the United Nations" and in Arkansas because it refers to poor people as "underprivileged." The California Investigating Committee confirmed as a principal charge against Goslin that he permitted the use of a textbook *American Democracy Today and Tomorrow* written by three educators and published by Harcourt Brace. It states: "The use of this text in our high-school classroom today constitutes a menace to the principle of freedom of individual thought and action." Why? Because it "praises farmer-owned corporative oil wells and co-operative insurance companies"; it has good words to say for TVA; it even argues that price controls can become "a reinforcement of the principles of free enterprise."

Still worse, in the committee's eyes, *American Democracy Today and Tomorrow* listed as recommended reading books by authors cited as subversive by the California Committee on Un-American Activities. They include *The Living Jefferson* by James Truslow Adams (1 citation), *The American Leviathan* by Dr. Charles Beard (5 citations), 12 books by Stuart Chase (9 citations), *The Fight for Life* by Paul de Kruif (6 citations), *The Autobiography of an Ex-Colored Man* by James Weldon Johnson (2 citations), *Middletown* by Robert and Helen Lynd (19 citations), *Technics and Civilization* by Lewis Mumford (10 citations), *Our Free Minds* by Harry Overstreet (7 citations) and *Too Big* by Morris

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Ernst (5 citations including the American Civil Liberties Union "cited as being heavily infiltrated with Communists and frequently following the Communist line and defending Communists").

These of course are only a few of the textbooks condemned by Congressional committees. The Fourth Report of the Senate Fact Finding Committee on Un-American Activities for 1948 lists as further subversive authors of textbooks Pearl Buck, Edward Corsi, Sherwood Anderson, Arthur Garfield Hays, Frank Lloyd Wright, Frank Graham, Sidney and Beatrice Webb and many more. Pages of the Buchanan Committee hearings recount the efforts of business groups to drive Keynesian economics out of our university classrooms. This the Committee concludes, "smacks too much of the book-burning orgies of Nuremburg to be accepted without foreboding and alarm."

As the universities have fallen into financial disrepair, the pressures upon them from business groups have mounted. The Commission on Financing Higher Education endorses the proposal advanced by business leaders that our corporations should finance our colleges and universities out of otherwise taxable profits. That this financing will command its *quid pro quo* is indicated in *Barron's* editorial "By Their Own Petard." Certainly, argues this business journal, the universities are in bad shape. That is their own fault. And if they want help from business they must first purge the faculty critics of capitalism who have foisted high taxes and full employment policies on our free enterprise nation.

At this moment the witch hunters appear. If they do no more than "expose" professors already cited, they will win headlines. Velde has stated that Harvard, Columbia, Chicago and Yale are under investigation. Allen Zoll, in his "Reducators" series, has already done the spade work of crossfiling names and citations. There are 35 "Reducators" at Yale according to Zoll, including two aged professors of divinity who "snipe and sneer at capitalism." There are 60 "Reducators" at Chicago, including G. A. Borghese, Paul Douglas, Harold Urey and Quincy Wright. There are 76 "Reducators" at Harvard, from Kirtley Mather and Harlow Shapley to President James B. Conant who once criticized the wrong Congressional committee. At Columbia there are 87 "Reducators" by Zoll's count. There are Gene Weltfish, Harry Grundfest and Corliss Lamont. There are also Dean Carman, who signed a petition to abolish the Dies Committee, Professor John Childs, who opposed delivery of scrap iron to Japan, and Reinhold Niebuhr, with 20 citations against his name.

Dr. Dodd maintained that in the peak years of 1944 there were only 1,500 Communist teachers in America, and the Communist Party has shrunk from 90,000 in 1938 to 30,000 since then. That is why McCarthy is now concerned with "Communist thinkers." Of these there are no end, if one who defends the rights of all citizens including Communists is thereby a "Communist Thinker." And why stop with the living? There is John Dewey who earned 15 citations from 1937 to 1944. There is Henry David Thoreau, well known as a subversive, who advocated civil disobedience. There is Ralph Waldo Emerson, a typical fellow-traveler, who said: "Whoso would be a man must be a non-conformist. He who would gather immortal palms must not be hindered by the *name* of goodness but must explore if it be goodness." There is the "Communist thinker" John Stuart Mill who declared in *Liberty* that "since the general and prevailing opinion on any subject is rarely or never the whole truth, it is only by the collision of adverse opinions that the remainder of the truth has any chance of being supplied." There is the notorious agitator Thomas Jefferson, who in an unguarded moment swore on the altar of Almighty God eternal hostility to all tyranny over the mind of man. There is Milton who supported armed rebellion and opposed all censorship; and Socrates who believed that learning and truth were gained by unrestricted debate. There is one whose rejection of prevailing values is plainly recorded in the New Testament.

The proper subject for investigation now is not the universities, but the Congressional investigating committees. Congress itself was so much aware of the dangers and abuses of these committees that it refused to sanction a permanent investigations committee of any kind until 1938. The abuses of the Un-American Activities Committee in circulating blacklists have exceeded the worst fears expressed then. At all times, Congressional investigations are supposed to be directed only to the preparation of legislation. That limitation has been terribly abused and the rights of the executive, the judiciary and the citizen usurped and undermined.

No legislation can follow an investigation of "Communist thinkers" in the schools. Thus no investigation is proper. The professors ordered to crawl, the college presidents ordered to fire those who will not, the trustees called on to break reluctant presidents may soon be tested. Their stand is plain. Teachers who commit crimes should like all citizens be punished. That is the responsibility of the courts. Teachers who use their classrooms for propaganda, whether for the Communist Party *or the Republican Party*, should be fired as bad teachers. That is the responsibility of the universities. Teachers who pursue free inquiry and voice free opinions are responsible only to their own consciences. On their rights rests the United States.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE WEEK

SPOILING THE HOUSING

The dilemma facing President-elect Eisenhower in the selection of a new Housing Administrator offers a revealing illustration of the confusing prospects in the housing field.

The real-estate industry, generally, made a major contribution to the election of the new President. Now they want the pay-off: the top government housing position. The long list of applications falls into three categories: the lenders—such as the mortgage bankers, the builders and a third, catch-all, group including people devoted to the public interest.

The third group is out of the running. Primarily, candidates backed by the National Association of Home Builders are vying with candidates backed by the Mortgage Bankers Association. The Home Builders see little or no increase in interest rates, long amortization and a continuation of the "Fannie Mae" program which permits the government to buy back mortgages from home owners unable to keep up payments. The Mortgage Bankers want a wholesale hiking of interest rates, short amortization and an end to "Fannie Mae."

Statements of both Sen. Homer Capehart (R, Ind.) and Rep. Jesse Wolcott (R, Mich.) chairmen of the Senate and House Banking and Currency Committees, place them in close agreement with the Mortgage Bankers. Both of these key committee chairmen advocate the interest-rate increase.

Without waiting for the new Administration to take office, officials of the Home and Housing Finance Agency, possibly to justify holding their jobs under their new bosses, have already agreed to an increase in rates from 4¾ to 5¼ percent on a special group of rural FHA houses costing below $5,000. The increase, labeled by the agency as a service charge, was necessitated by a lack of mortgage money, largely caused by refusal of the mortgage bankers to accept loans at the lower rate.

Such "strikes" of mortgage bankers for higher rates have proved unsuccessful in the past. The current ones illustrate the power of the lending groups.

The odds are that their candidate will be named Housing Administrator.

Concurrently, Wolcott has been making enticing promises to the Washington area Home Builders. He promised that they, alone, would be constructing American homes in the future. Public housing would not be tolerated. He added: "I like to think that the pressures of socialized housing are a thing of the past and can give you better than reasonable assurance that no legislation will be passed in the next four years that allows socialization of any segment of our economy."

THE LONG BATTLE AHEAD

The lond-range paths of President-elect Eisenhower and Senator Taft are already openly diverging. Taft on a national television broadcast emphatically stated that he will insist on the "right" of Senators to originate patronage suggestions. Attorney - General - designate Herbert Brownell has cleared some appointments with Republican governors and state chairmen instead. Taft can be expected to rage and scream against this becoming accepted practice, and can count on wholehearted support from GOP Senators of every coloration on this one issue.

Taft's chance for long-run supremacy in the party depends on keeping final patronage authority in the Senate. The Dewey-Brownell dream of a new Eisenhower party rests on breaking that hold and building up the power of the governors and the state party organizations.

Dewey and Brownell apparently have impressed Eisenhower deeply by their ability to plan and see ahead. In an aside in a welcoming speech for Churchill, Eisenhower remarked to Dewey before a large audience that he believed Dewey's "most useful years lie ahead." Taftmen be forewarned.

THE ROSENBERG CASE

As we go to press, the case of Julius and Ethel Rosenberg, the convicted atom spies, is before the US pardon attorney on a clemency plea, and will soon be before the President—possibly Truman, but more probably Eisenhower. Meanwhile, the Communist section of the world is in an uproar, doing its best to make clemency more difficult by maintaining that the Rosenbergs are innocent, were victims of a frame-up, are being punished because they are Jews, are being slaughtered by American capitalism, and so on.

Most of this is nonsense. The Rosenbergs are guilty, like their fellow-conspirators, David Greenglass, Harry Gold and Milton Sobell. They have had nearly two years in which to exhaust every legal resource in the vain effort to show that there was some unfairness in their trial. Their crime was a monstrous one, which has done harm to their country. There is every evidence that they are still unrepentant. They are willing to be martyrs, and no one can doubt that the Communists secretly prefer them in that role.

In spite of all this, we believe that the Rosenbergs' sentence should be commuted to life imprisonment, not because of the Communist arguments but in spite of them, not for the sake of these convicted spies but for the sake of America's worldwide position. Millions of non-Communists in countries allied with us are troubled by the severity of these sentences. Klaus Fuchs and Alan Nunn May, whose crimes paralleled the Rosenbergs', got sentences of only a few years; Gold, Sobell and Greenglass got sentences averaging 25 years each, minus many years for good behavior. One of our chief weapons against Russia is the accusation of excessively harsh sentences, and the execution of the Rosenbergs will greatly weaken our future use of this line of attack. We will benefit far more by not competing with the Communists in this field.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE DULLES-EISENHOWER PLAN FOR ASIA

INDO-CHINA rather than Korea is now seen in Europe as likely to be the top priority of the new US policy in Asia. One reason is plain: while Korea is a dead end, Indo-China is the waystation from which the Japanese were able in 1941 and 1942 to pour through southern Asia, advancing almost to the frontier of India. Moreover, Japan is now the chosen instrument of US policy in Asia. And John Foster Dulles said in Paris last May: "Indo-China is the key to Southeast Asia, upon the resources of which Japan largely depends."

There is also a longer-term but not less important reason. While Korea is the scene of naked Communist military aggression, Indo-China is a place where political Communism has been able to exploit, for military ends, the repercussions of an authentic struggle between nationalism and colonialist imperialism. The implications in Asian terms of Syngman Rhee's struggle against Mao Tse-tung are less significant than those of Ho Chi-minh's struggle against the French. History is the element that counts here. For, as the *Observer* of London comments:

> There is need for France to realize that though she has now nominally conceded to Viet-Nam as much as Ho Chi-minh demanded in 1946, she is marching several paces behind history which, since then, has seen the complete independence of India, Pakistan, Ceylon, Burma and Indonesia.

European statesmen, who are also students of world history, accept Dulles as a fellow-member in excellent standing of their club. Watching the evolution of his political ideas since before the 1948 US Presidential campaign, they think they have seen the strong influence of Arnold Toynbee. For they find in the British historian's pet theory that civilizations rise and fall in relation to a process of "challenge and response" the source of the US Secretary of State's political gospel of "liberation" and military dogma of "dynamism."

These are to be the US response to the Soviet challenge, the policy with which General Eisenhower will replace the presumably "static" Truman-Acheson policy of containment. The place where the response is to be given its first trial is Asia, not merely Korea but the whole area from Korea to India where Communist Chinese imperialism is already dangerous. And in this area, Indo-China is the center of the front.

The Dulles-Eisenhower plan, as reported over here, is to increase US help to the French so as to defeat Ho Chi-minh's Viet-Minh within two years. The US is to give all aid, short of troops, and at the same time to warn Peking that overt, direct Chinese intervention would have serious consequences. US equipment and weapons, especially airplanes, will be poured into the country, diverted if necessary from Korea and US troops in Europe. US training will be given to the Viet-Nam forces.

The French will be called upon to fulfill three precise conditions: to furnish at least two more French divisions for Indo-Chinese fighting; to make a definite and clear offer of full independence, effective by a certain date, to the Viet-Nam; to ratify the European Defense Community Treaty, also by a definite date. In exchange, actual West German rearmament will be delayed until the successful end of the Indo-Chinese war, at which time the return of French troops to Europe will redress the Franco-German military disbalance. As a further concession to French fears, efforts will be made to get the British to join the EDC.

The goal is not all-out war against the Mao Tse-tung and Communist China. It is to block any advance into southern Asia, and thereby to weaken Peking's prestige and power in the general Asian balance. This can be done in two years by crushing the Viet-Minh. When it is done—and not before—the US will be prepared to negotiate with Mao Tse-tung for a general political settlement. The limited purpose of US intervention in Indo-China will permit Chiang Kai-shek's troops to be used without political dangers. Nevertheless, they will be used only for harrying raids on the China coast in support of the Indo-Chinese operations.

The Dulles-Eisenhower plan is neat and clear enough. Yet the historically-minded statesmen in England and France, the countries with the oldest and largest stakes in Asia, fear—for rather different reasons—that it may be out of step with history, both practical and theoretical. Toynbee himself expressed the opinion quite recently that the supreme challenge to the West now rises neither in Russia nor in China. It lies in the peoples who are not yet pledged either to the Soviet or to the US camp, chiefly the masses in the colonialist or formerly colonialist areas, who "may prove to hold the casting vote in a competition between Russia and the West for world power."

The intention to put more French troops into the field without or before a large-scale political offensive to win over the Viet-Namese people is not likely to broaden the popular participation and support which are still the only known effective weapons against Communism in colonialist countries.

As for the calculated risk, Peking has already delivered a warning, through New Delhi, that any extension of international military activities from Korea to Indo-China would definitely bring in active Chinese intervention. The point is not the step-up in US material support: Soviet military material is already being delivered to the Viet-Minh over the new railway to the Indo-Chinese border; the US is providing some $300 million a year in military aid, and another $100 million for such construction work as airfields and harbors. The point is that the French are already creating more Communists in Indo-China than they can kill. The Dulles-Eisenhower plan, unless it is amended at once to shift the emphasis from the French to the Viet-Namese and to create a balance between political and military goals, runs the risk of making Indo-China the tragically wrong response to the wrong challenge in Asia.

Paris PERCY WINNER

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TEACHERS IN THE TOILS

by Broadus Mitchell

SCHOOLS, teachers and texts are being held up to suspicion or condemnation all over the country. Here Broadus Mitchell explains some of the ways complaints arise and the qualities that provoke them. This essay arises from his own observations in 35 years of teaching, and his service on the Academic Freedom Committee of the American Civil Liberties Union. Dr. Mitchell is professor of economics at Rutgers University.

THE PUBLIC, or that large part of the public that has touch with schools and colleges only at second or third hand if at all, is apt to regard teachers as the beneficiaries of society's charity. They do not produce quite as other workers do, but they enjoy the fruits of others' labors. Therefore the public has a proprietary command over them, a leave for special censure. Educators are the servants of the community and on occasion are called to task by their master. At such times the instructor is required to exhibit a perfect purity of conduct without regard to the actual conditions under which he lives and performs from day to day and from year to year.

The chief disability of the educator when suddenly obliged to give an account of his stewardship is exactly that he is an educator. That is, he is constantly engaged in a process of learning himself and of developing the knowledge and attitudes of others, principally his pupils. It is a part of a mechanic's wisdom that a patron should never judge a job until it is finished. The teacher's work is never finished. It is a projection, something intended to unfold. Halt him at any one moment, stop him in the middle of a sentence, as it were, and you are apt to get a false notion of what he is about.

No teacher is immune from censure, no matter how remote his subject from the controversies of life and no matter how scrupulously he sticks to his specialty. However, those professing history, economics, government, sociology, theology, philosophy and the biological sciences are likely to be more vulnerable than others. They deal with sensitive departments of security—security of property, of rights, of beliefs. Their teachings may tend to unsettle what is precious because it is accepted.

What is said in the classroom ought to be a privileged communication. Practically, it is not so, and more's the pity. Pupils who by very definition stand in need of instruction and who are not capable of judging at the moment of what they are hearing, innocently report at home or elsewhere what the teacher is supposed to have said. Here is a situation made for misunderstanding. The testimony is at second hand, by a poor witness at a distance in time and place. The parent, friend, supervisor, editor or legislator takes alarm at a sentiment or remark which, even if verbally accurate, is necessarily torn from context. The third person invests the statement, allusion or argument with his own convictions or prejudices, and as he hands it on, every step in transmittal damages the original. Happy is the teacher who can recognize his own saying when it comes back to him, frequently in the mouth of an inquisitorial official or board.

The chance of faithful reverberation of the first utterance is less because every teacher, in the nature of his art, deals in exaggerations. This is almost the obligatory pedagogical method. For the sake of conveying the truth as he sees it, the teacher tells more than the truth or less than the truth. In a series, the distortions cancel one another, but you need the progression, the neutralizing juxtaposition.

My observation is that the tendency toward, almost the habit of, overstress or understress belongs as much to the university lecture hall as to the grammar-school or high-school classroom, perhaps more so. Principals, superintendents, boards of education, deans, presidents and trustees may know from their own experience in their positions that teachers legitimately draw their thought pictures out of proportion, but when called upon to appraise a teacher's performance following on public clamor, are apt to forget their underlying knowledge. Any teacher who has been called on the carpet—worst of all by his faculty colleagues in a chastising frame—will remember the contrast between the self-righteous standards they seek to apply and the necessities of his own conduct. Of course, in honorable instances they defend valiantly. But often, especially if members of a faculty committee of inquiry see themselves as likely next on the list unless they mete out sentence, they quickly become severe judges.

This goes to more than an accused teacher's individual utterances. It reaches his whole academic performance, his behavior as a citizen, the very particulars of his manner and dress. The institution for years may harbor professors who, perhaps with excellent reason, publish little or nothing. But let one fall afoul of the community's criticism and suddenly he is reminded that every member of that faculty is expected to make his

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

printed contribution to creative scholarship. How did he suppose he could continue there without being informed, prudent, wise, without writing books at reasonable intervals and articles in between, without pretty faithful attendance at scholarly meetings and appearance on their programs? The particular verbal lapse under scrutiny becomes a crack in his armor whereby all his greaves and plates may be pried apart until he stands pitiably naked.

In a period of mounting hysteria like the present it is apt to be demanded that the instructor in a controversial field, or any teacher in his community contacts, shall not inculcate unpopular opinions. From the nature of his calling, especially in addressing his students, he must preserve neutrality of views. If he adheres to a novel or minority belief and lets this be known, he is accused of "indoctrination." The charge has taken on a horrid significance. Yet any teacher who goes to his work with zest and enlivens the minds of his students has a slant on his subject, wants that commitment to appear, and if it may be applied in practical affairs wants to further the application. All teaching is selection. Every part of the truth, if there be such, may not be unfolded.

The great, remembered scholars and teachers in political economy, and in every other field, recommended the conclusions that seemed good to them. As often as not they made few converts at the moment—their reward came later—but their teaching was an act of honesty and acquired meaning for their hearers no matter how unpersuaded the latter might be. Actually, to impress a thesis, the opposing evidence and arguments must be elaborated with unusual fidelity. A teacher who has merely a shallow prejudice, as opposed to a reasoned position, cannot last long in good repute. He has to talk too much, read too much, traverse too much ground, must too constantly defend his views in the company of his colleagues.

Teachers are often pounced upon not for sentiments expressed on the campus but for remarks supposedly dropped in speeches in the community. The objector may not have been present, but was piqued by a newspaper or other report. Institutions are usually glad to have faculty members answer calls from program chairmen of all sorts of gatherings, of alumni, businessmen and civic leagues. Generally the work is unpaid and is always overtime. If the audience is to remain awake, the talk of the "professor" must be without manuscript and as popular and applicable as possible. In panels the debate may become warm. The academic participant may not measure his words beyond a point. He is not sitting in his study or committing his thoughts to paper for a learned journal. Besides, he is exercising a citizen's rights to hold opinions and give them expression.

Let him provoke a hearer to protest and he is reminded that he is expected to speak uniformly with responsible deliberation. He should remain, as somebody said, "a textbook wired for sound." The average dean will repel several pained letters from those who think their youth are being misled; he will defend the speaker off-campus without so much as letting him know he has been protected. But repetition of thrusts begins to persuade the dean, president or other that this faculty member has a loose tongue and should be cautioned. If warning seems to be disregarded, the conviction grows that this errant fellow "is getting to be a nuisance," particularly if the community critic points the accusing finger with one hand and jingles money in his pocket with the other.

An inescapable menace to the candid teacher or scholar is the on-coming crop of university graduates offering for faculty places. They are younger, more recently trained, and cheaper. In their eagerness to be engaged they are not mindful of trespasses on academic freedom by institutions to which they aspire. You cannot blame them, for they are hungry and they had no part in the unhappy infraction. Faculty members of standing, especially if they are active in the American Association of University Professors or the American Federation of Teachers, may be reluctant to take the place of a colleague who has been unjustly ousted. But even these are given the formal decision of the investigating committee of their organization only belatedly. Sad to relate, too many are tempted to seize upon the assurance, industriously disseminated, that the victim was brought to grief not by exercise of his academic freedom but by some personality defect. This last is liable to be ill-defined, maybe wrapped up in the complacent charge that the teacher dismissed was "unco-operative."

Tenure is less of a protection to the accused teacher than might be supposed. Often, for what it is worth, tenure is not acquired until he has served, on annual or short-term appointments, for seven years or more. A good deal may happen in the trial period. A growing number of institutions of higher education, faced with military draft of students, have adopted the plan of taking faculty members for a short span as instructors, lecturers and the like, fully intending to usher them out before they acquire better status. That leaves the cadre of permanent faculty relatively small and composed of oldsters whose lapses are few and who are armored with reputation. But even these may not be secure in indefinite appointment. If one is involved in a real hubbub, he may find that the institution's commitment to him is only technical. Tenure is no better than the attachment of the institution to the principle of academic freedom.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ANTI-INTELLECTUALISM IN THE SCHOOLS

by Arthur E. Bestor Jr.

FROM THE POINT of view of finances and equipment, the American public-school system is something of which to be immensely proud. Enrollment has increased steadily, until today four out of every five American children between the ages of five and 17, inclusive, are in school. We talk so much about overcrowding that we are apt to forget the significant fact that the equipment and resources of the public schools have increased far more rapidly than enrollment. Compared with 1870, every child now enrolled spends twice as many days per year in the classroom. The proportion of teachers to pupils is greater, and the teachers are required to have spent far more time in training. After adjustments are made for the changed value of the dollar, we find that nine times as much money is spent per year on the education of *each* child, and 13 times as much is invested in the buildings and equipment that each one uses. Inequalities and inadequacies exist, of course, and these must be eliminated. But the fact remains that the American people have generously and faithfully supported their schools. They have a right to ask whether school administrators have served the American people with equal faithfulness. Is the qualitative educational achievement of our public schools commensurate with the money and effort that have been invested in them?

Since the answer I am about to give is in the negative, I shall be automatically branded an enemy of the public schools by those who have a vested interest in the educational status quo. To repel such a charge, allow me to offer at the outset a full and frank confession of faith. I am a firm believer in the principle of universal, public, democratic education. I believe that publicly financed education from the nursery school through the highest levels of graduate and professional instruction is essential to American democracy as we know and value it. I have no sympathy whatever with anyone who proposes to cut school appropriations in such a way as to limit educational opportunity or to impair the quality of instruction. I believe in doing away with every barrier that race, religion or economic status interposes to prevent any American from pursuing to the highest levels any form of study for which he has the intellectual capacity, the desire and the will. I believe, finally, in academic freedom. I conceive it to be the scholar's duty to resist every effort to stifle the free and responsible investigation and discussion of public issues. And I stand ready to oppose to the uttermost any group that seeks to limit or pervert the curricula of schools and colleges in order to impose upon them their own narrow and dogmatic preconceptions concerning matters that are properly the subject of free inquiry.

The great issue today is not whether the American school system ought to be democratic—of course it ought. The issue is whether the school system ought to be *educational.* And the further question arises, if the public-school system ceases to be educational, can it possibly avoid being anti-democratic as well?

Some of the slogans by which professional educators mask their anti-intellectual purposes sound plausibly democratic. "It is the job of the school," reads one of the most influential current statements of educational policy, "to meet the common and the specific individual needs of youth." This, of course, is nonsense. If it were true, then the school would be in the business of supplying food, clothing and shelter. Obviously the school exists to satisfy the needs of individuals and of society. But it is designed to meet, and is capable of meeting, certain needs only. The school is one, but only one, of the agencies of society that minister to young people's needs. The family, the church, the medical profession, the government, private business—all exist to satisfy the needs of men and women, young and old. Some may not do the job as we would wish. But that affords no excuse for the school to neglect its task also, in a vain attempt to remedy the deficiency. The idea that the school must undertake to meet every need that some other agency is failing to meet is a preposterous delusion that can wreck the educational system without contributing anything to the salvation of society.

The school has its own job to do, and the nation is threatened with disaster if the school fails to do that job superlatively well. Many vital needs of men cannot be satisfied except through the extensive and rigorous application of intellectual means. No agency but the school can provide the systematic, disciplined intellectual training required. This is, and always has been, the primary, indispensable function of the school. The nation is betrayed if the school shirks this responsibility or subordinates it to any other aim, however worthy in itself. The school exists to provide intellectual training, in every field of activity where systematic thinking is an important component of success. It exists to provide it for every citizen who has the capacity and the will to apply intellectual means to the solution of the problems that

Arthur E. Bestor Jr., Professor of History at the University of Illinois, received the Beveridge Award of the American Historical Society for his book Backwoods Utopias.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

confront him. And it exists to encourage intellectual effort on the part of every citizen, whether or not he possesses intellectual background to begin with.

This is not to say that the school can be indifferent to the vocational needs of its students, to their physical development, or to the problem of moral conduct. It merely means that the school shares responsibility in these matters with other agencies of society, and that it must make its contribution within the context provided by its own characteristic activity. Schooling is better than apprenticeship as preparation for a job, only if it leads a man to grasp the theory behind the practice. Physical education makes sense only if it is linked with a knowledge of physiology, only if it teaches a man to participate in sports for the sake of his own physical fitness, and only if it resolutely resists the diversion of school resources into the subsidizing of gladiatorial contests between muscular mercenaries. Finally, morality permeates all activities of life, assuming special form in each. In the schoolroom it appears primarily as intellectual honesty and as that species of reflectiveness which converts a mere taboo into an ethical imperative. In all these great spheres of life, the particular contribution which the school can make is determined by, and related to, the fact that it is an agency of intellectual training.

An increasing number of public-school administrators and educational theorists today refuse to define the purposes of the school in terms of intellectual training or of the recognized disciplines of science and scholarship. In my own state a publicly supported Illinois Secondary School Curriculum Program has circulated a series of questionnaires purporting to ask citizens, teachers and pupils what they "think is the job of the secondary school." History, mathematics, science and foreign languages are nowhere mentioned, hence no one is permitted to suggest that training in these fields might be even a part of "the job of the secondary school." Instead the school is supposed to be concerned with a pot-pourri of 55 "problems of high-school youth," in which "the problem of acquiring the social skills of dancing, playing party games, doing parlor stunts, etc." is given just as much emphasis as "the problem of acquiring the ability to study and help solve economic, social and political problems." The educators never tell how the school is going to give its students the latter, much-to-be-desired ability. Time will obviously not be allowed for systematic training in the disciplines of history or political science or economics. These have already been merged into the social studies, and the latter are eventually to be swallowed up, so the Illinois Curriculum Program hopes, by a "common learnings course" in which "materials from science, literature, history, mathematics, industrial education, homemaking, business education, art, music and all other areas of the curriculum would be included."

An inkling of what the educators mean when they propose to bring the great issues of public life down to the level of what they call the "real-life problems of youth" is afforded by an elaborate report on *The Schools and National Security,* which the Illinois Curriculum Program has recently published. The first task of the social studies, according to the chapter devoted to them, is to "reduce the tensions and meet the *needs* of children and youth." There are some starry-eyed promises about developing "a constructively critical attitude toward foreign policy" among pupils who, of course, are not to be burdened with any useless knowledge of history or geography or foreign languages. And when the report gets down to specific classroom work, it solemnly suggests that the schools can serve the nation in its present hour of peril by asking its students to "make studies of how the last war affected the dating pattern in our culture."

This nonsense is described as "life-adjustment education," and it masquerades as a democratic program for the schools. In point of fact it takes its origin from one of the most blatantly anti-democratic resolutions ever formulated by a conference of American educators. The first Commission on Life Adjustment Education for Youth was appointed by the United States Commissioner as a result of the following statement adopted by a group of educators in 1945:

> It is the belief of this conference that, with the aid of this report in final form, the vocational school of a community will be able better to prepare 20 percent of the youth of secondary-school age for entrance upon desirable skilled occupations; and that the high school will continue to prepare another 20 percent for entrance to college. We do not believe that the remaining 60 percent of our youth of secondary-school age will receive the life-adjustment training they need and to which they are entitled as American citizens —unless and until the administrators of public education with the assistance of the vocational-education leaders formulate a similar program for this group.

Consider for a moment the extraordinary implications of this statement. Sixty percent—three-fifths—of the citizens of the United States, it asserts without qualification, are incapable of being benefited by intellectual training or even training for skilled and desirable occupations. If this is true, it is a fact of the most shattering significance, for it declares invalid most of the assumptions that have underlain American democracy. It enthrones once again the ancient doctrine that the majority of the people are destined from birth to be

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hewers of wood and drawers of water to a select few who, by right of superior fitness, are to occupy the privileged places in society.

Let me be perfectly clear. I am not criticizing the work of experimental psychologists and of those professional educators who combine sound scholarship with a knowledge of pedagogy. What they have done to improve the methods by which the recognized disciplines are to be effectively taught is a worthy and important work. They are modest enough to recognize that they have neither the authority nor the competence to tamper with the purposes and the organization of the curriculum.

What I am criticizing is the arrogance of those secondary-school educators who believe that they own the schools and can mold them as they please without regard to the rest of the scientific, intellectual and professional life of the nation. I am condemning the sweeping conclusions concerning the intellectual incapacity of the American people which are being pronounced by educational administrators who are not themselves psychologists, which are supported by little more than subjective impressions, and which frequently confuse a lack of background and interest with a lack of intellectual capacity. I am condemning the reckless remaking of the public-school curriculum on the basis of these completely unverified conclusions. And I am condemning the substitution of high-powered propaganda for scientific objectivity in the process of carrying out what the educators describe as experiments.

It is my considered judgment that every one of these basic requirements of scientific, ethical experimentation upon human beings has been violated in the launching of the current programs of curricular change.

By dallying with "life-adjustment education" the schools are doing more than merely discarding intellectual training. They are actively teaching the public a concept for intellectual effort. By its very nature the school cannot be neutral in the matter of intellectual values, any more than a church can be neutral on the question of virtue. It either fosters respect for thought or it fosters the opposite. And if it does not foster respect for thought it obviously cannot foster respect for freedom of thought. If the schools are indifferent to intellectual values, the only conclusion which the public can draw is that intellectual values are worth very little, and that the destruction of them—the suppression of freedom of thought, of speech, and of teaching—is the destruction of something expendable.

In the long run the only real safeguard of intellectual freedom is widespread public respect for intellectual values. Only the public schools can give to the people at large a genuine understanding of intellectual effort and a sense of its vital importance to free men and to a free nation. To build our defense of freedom firm and deep, we need to eradicate, before it is too late, the anti-intellectual tendencies that have crept into our public-educational system. We must restore to the schools the clear and disciplined intellectual purpose that will make them once again the bulwarks of thought, and hence of freedom of thought.

In this effort we can count upon the support of an unknown number—but I suspect, an overwhelming majority—of the classroom teachers of the nation, who are distressed at the programs being imposed upon them. We can count upon the support of a very considerable number of professors of education and public-school administrators who dissent from the party-line laid down by the powerful educational associations, by the public-school bureaucracy, and by the more vocal members of university departments of education. But because of the existence of this party-line and this structure of power, we cannot count upon the organized educational profession as such to safeguard the intellectual purpose and the intellectual integrity of our secondary schools.

It is the duty of scholars, scientists and members of the learned professions generally, to speak with a clear and independent voice in these matters. Co-operation with professional educators must continue, of course, in the devising of sound programs for the public schools. But on matters of high educational policy the learned world must speak with a voice unmistakably its own, and must not allow its words to be smothered or twisted or censored by others. It must speak directly to the general public, who make the final decisions on educational policy. It must express, continuously and unitedly, its considered judgment on the intellectual soundness of the programs that are offered in the public schools. Scholars have not done this effectively in the past, and the views of the professional educators have prevailed largely by default. If scholars will create for themselves an organ through which they can speak with clarity and force, I am confident that they will be listened to with respect. I have proposed to the learned societies of the country the creation of a Permanent Scientific and Scholarly Commission on Secondary Education, completely independent of the existing educational associations and of pressure groups whose interest in the public schools is sometimes of a dubious character.

Through such a Commission, I believe, the learned world can provide responsible leadership to the millions of Americans who believe both in democracy and in sound education and who are anxious to rescue the schools from those who act as if democratic education were synonymous with intellectual mediocrity.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

POINT FOUR AND THE BATTLE FOR ASIA

VII. THE FUTURE—A POLICY OF ATTAINMENT

by Clarence E. Decker

POINT FOUR marks a major development—almost a revolution—in American foreign policy. Prior to the last war our global affairs were left to the diplomat and the soldier. Today a third person, who might be described as the social engineer, has been added. This man—whether agriculturalist, industrialist, banker, businessman, administrative expert, health specialist or teacher—seeks to unleash the world's vast physical and human resources and to put them to work for a dynamic society.

For three years he has worked in the pioneering Point Four program. Many of its achievements are exciting, some of them monumental. Nonetheless, Point Four today faces hostility in influential areas of American life. The resurgent isolationists decry its "entangling alliances"; the "dollar diplomats" scorn its "charity"; and a "hard money" Congress threatens its relatively modest appropriations. If these sentiments and the current reaction against the costly military buildup of the Free World blind us to the urgency of expanding Point Four, the result may be economic and political collapse abroad and depression at home. For, as a creditor nation, we are dependent on international stability and co-operation. Our annual $5 billion excess of exports over imports roughly measures the dollar shortage abroad and the cost of our assistance. American business, whose investments in overseas plants have increased from $8.4 billion to $15 billion the past six years, and foreign enterprise, whose materials and products must flow in increasing amounts into our economy, will not flourish in an atmosphere of isolationism and retrenchment.

"Trade not aid" can become a sensible goal rather than a beguiling slogan, but we have first to overcome, at home and abroad, the intrenched hostility of special interests to a drastic reduction in trade barriers. Even if we achieve this, sound but imaginative loans, convertible currencies, long-range agreements for the production of basic materials, and a vigorous Point Four program are essential if trade is to flow freely into world markets.

The necessity of a basic, long-range development program, geared to the major objective of helping distressed friends help themselves to become permanently strong partners in the community of free nations, should be put plainly before the voters to assure their continuing support.

A long-range program would balance the present bias in Point Four toward food productivity by development in industry, public works and public administration, and, particularly, by courageous effort (heretofore neglected) to equalize population and resources. For the unrest in underdeveloped countries comes from city as well as rural people who require more manageable family units, adequate living standards, improved working conditions, more effective government, and larger economic and political freedom. Our present "grass-roots" fixation often leaves the impression locally that the sole aim of Point Four is to keep underdeveloped countries as cheap raw-material hinterlands. These countries are humiliated by this new "colonialism."

Local investment should be encouraged to finance the long-range development of Point Four pilot projects. The investment of capital overseas should be stimulated by eliminating discriminatory restrictions and providing guarantees for a proper return. And an international investment fund should be established to give continuity to the program of balancing and boosting total economies.

Concurrently, influence must be brought on feudalistic interests that frustrate the social reform essential to a viable economy. Without land, tax, labor, administrative, election and civil-liberties reform, Point Four will continue to be vulnerable on the charge that it helps the few rich get richer and the many poor grow poorer.

The time is long overdue for merging our more than 20 overseas economic programs into one development agency, separated from defense and diplomacy, regionalized in accordance with realistic geographical and political conditions, and patterned on country to country requirements. A first step—as recommended by the Brookings Institution and the Gray and Rockefeller reports—is the integration of the Point Four programs of the Mutual Security Agency and the Technical Cooperation Administration.

I stress the importance of separating Point Four assistance from military aid. A clear distinction between the two would clarify our peaceful objectives and provide a strong psychological appeal to the highest idealism of our own people and of our friends abroad. I likewise stress the importance of separating Point Four, which is

Dr. Clarence R. Decker, president of the University of Kansas City, recently toured Southeast Asia as Assistant Director of the Mutual Security Agency in charge of the Far Eastern Program. This is the last of a series of articles which constitute his report.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

concerned with research, experimentation, production and management, from the Department of State, which is concerned mainly with political affairs.

The integration of our own efforts should lead to closer co-operation among all the Free World's Point Four programs, at the top policy level and in the field, with the view of channeling more and more of our undertakings through the United Nations.

Point Four attacks international tension at its psychological as well as its economic roots. The most casual traveler in Asia quickly senses a strange mixture of admiration, anxiety and disdain toward the West. My own impression, contrary to that of some others, is that Asians genuinely like most Americans, but that they hold certain deeply felt reservations about us. We are the rich uncle and they often betray an understandable envy of the vast power, wealth and world prominence that we have acquired in a relatively short period. They appreciate help, but they know, as some Americans occasionally forget, that our help is designed to save us as well as Asia. They feel that we frequently allow short-run domestic considerations to shape our long-time international judgments, that we are so far to the "Right" that we cannot understand the peculiar nature of their political problems. They suspect at times that we may try to force an "imperialist capitalist democracy" on all the rest of the world. They admit that our democracy works reasonably well at home, but they object to the notion that it is invariably superior to their own or better adapted to their needs. They think we are often hypocritical on matters of social justice. Our Negro problem, with assistance from Communist propaganda, is played up everywhere. Asians may not be directly concerned about our Negroes, but they see the problem in terms of the Oriental question. They feel that while our culture produces high living standards with a large amount of personal freedom, it also produces "high divorce rates, tawdry entertainment and stomach ulcers." Our movies abroad convey an impression of immaturity. As Mayor Singh of Delhi reminded a group of us:

> When the West is purely materialistic in conception as well as in practice—and most of the ills of the modern world are due to this materialism—we feel there is much the West can learn from us, as there is so much we in the East can learn from the West.

Unfortunately, Asia is too often convinced that what it can learn from us is purely technological. It does not believe that it has much to learn from our way of life.

Most Americans believe that these criticisms are either untrue or grossly exaggerated, but the important fact is that they are widely believed. Our task, therefore, is to assure our friends in practical deeds that we are not a Frankenstein monster. Even as our tractors, gadgets and skills circle the globe, our non-materialistic culture must be more widely understood. Our most precious ideals are embodied in our Bill of Rights, our government of law rather than of men, our faith that all peoples can achieve dignity and decency. Whatever our faults and failures, we have translated these ideals into a large measure of workable democracy. But, until recently, we have had little success in Asia in dramatizing these permanent values of our civilization.

And, unhappily, we know less about Asia than she knows about us. The matter of self-respect—of what Edgar Ansel Mowrer calls "equality of status"—is one of the most sensitive problems in our developing relations with the Far East. Asia feels that she has too long played "second fiddle" in world councils. The criticism in the Far East press of the ANZUS meeting last summer in Honolulu—of what it called the "Caucasian Conference on Asia"—is a case in point.

No President of the United States, Secretary of State or Director of the Mutual Security Agency has visited Asia. Last July, upon my return from Asia, I suggested a trip to the entire Far East—not Korea alone—by the President-elect between the election and the inauguration, a trip similar to that of President Hoover in the twenties and of President Roosevelt in 1936 to Latin America. Mrs. Roosevelt's tour of parts of Asia last year was widely acclaimed, and Governor Stevenson's and Secretary Dulles's proposed trips this spring will help.

Stalinism understands the power of ideas, the value of propaganda in disseminating them, and the importance of a peoples-to-peoples approach. In a statement some time ago, Andre Vishinsky said: "We shall conquer the world, not with atom bombs, but with something the Americans cannot produce—with our ideas, our brains, our doctrines."

In our stand against Stalinism, we are supporting the soldier and the statesman generously, as we should. But ultimately life is neither military nor political—it is moral. There is no defense—not even an Atlantic Charter, an atomic bomb, or an international army—against Soviet ideology except a superior cultural strength. As we trade American goods, services, ideas and ideals with Asia, we know that Asia—today as in her monumental past—has rich material and spiritual resources to trade with us. In such a two-way trade, we both win and Communism loses. In the meantime, as we provide modest assistance, we know that we the benefactor will benefit as much as the beneficiary. In foreign affairs, as in life itself, bread cast upon the waters will be found after many a day.

This is the moral and the mission of Point Four.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE HIGH COST OF HEALTH

by Seymour E. Harris

It is 20 years since the Committee on the Cost of Medical Care presented its famous reports. Under the sponsorship of President Hoover and Dr. Ray Lyman Wilbur, the Committee urged improvements in the techniques of financing which would ease the burdens of illness and provide better distribution of medicine. Ever since then the AMA has been alerted to fight every advance in the economics of medicine. First, it opposed prepayment plans, then comprehensive prepayment plans, then compulsory health insurance, which it maliciously calls socialized medicine, and, finally, federal subsidies to medical schools. On the day the new report of the President's Commission was released, the President of the AMA announced once again that it disagreed.

The distinguished Commission includes Dr. Paul B. Magnuson (Chairman), who did yeoman work as medical director of the Veterans Administration; Chester I. Barnard (Vice Chairman), former President of the Rockefeller Foundation; Dean A. Clark, General Director, Massachusetts General Hospital; Dr. Joseph C. Hinsey, Dean of the Cornell Medical College; Dr. Lowell Reed, Vice-President, Johns Hopkins University and Hospital; Walter P. Reuther, President, CIO. Others on the Commission, representing labor, nurses, dentistry, agriculture and medical groups, made important contributions. This group of leaders and experts did not recommend socialized medicine; not even national health insurance and not even that state and federal governments be required to subsidize private prepayment programs. The Commission sensed the hostility of the medical profession to NHI, and instead of urging an all-out program for NHI, it proposed a program which even General Eisenhower might endorse.

In fact, in the course of the hearings on NHI, Sen. Robert A. Taft himself had proposed federal grants to subsidize insurance for low-income groups. The major recommendation of the report is along similar lines except that the Commission, on the basis of thorough canvassing of the facts, was more aware than Senator Taft of the costs of such a program and the need of avoiding a Means Test. Taft's estimate was a cost of $600 million in all (one-half to be paid by the states); but the President's Commission proposes a *federal* subsidy of $750 million with additional contributions by state governments.

What the Commission proposes is comprehensive prepayment insurance for all, a tremendous advance, if it can be achieved, for although 75 million Americans are covered by insurance schemes and the numbers covered for hospital expenses has risen more than 60 times in 16 years, the fact remains that insurance still covers only 15 percent of private medical bills and perhaps only 10 percent of all medical costs. Dr. Falk, the distinguished expert of the Federal Security Agency, has demonstrated that under present plans any possible rise of coverage by private groups would only account for a small part of the 85 percent of medical expenses that are not covered today.

Just three in every one hundred Americans are protected today by comprehensive insurance plans. The reason is that comprehensive insurance is costly and, even more important, is strongly opposed by state and local medical societies. These organizations oppose the programs *in part* because they view them as mechanisms for channelling profitable business away from private practitioners, and because they are not anxious to join so long as payment is on a salary basis. They want their members to be paid on a fee-for-service basis, which is generally costly and wasteful. They want to protect the system of billing high-income patients more and low-income patients less, thus charging what the traffic will bear and obtaining larger revenue. Where they have endorsed insurance programs covering ordinary medical expenses, they have put a ceiling on incomes to be covered without an extra charge.

The present practices endorsed by the AMA are arbitrary, wasteful and yet inadequate for the good of the profession. The proportion of private outlays to income is roughly what it was 25 years ago, despite a per-capita rise of real income of about 50 percent after taxes. Well-established doctors may live well; internes and young doctors most certainly do not. The nation faces three urgent necessities, of channelling more money into medicine, bringing about the vital increase of doctors, hospitals and clinics and improving the distribution of medical services. These goals, the Commission believes, may be secured by its prepayment proposals.

The program for comprehensive insurance is not the only important recommendation made by the Commission. It calls further for increased expenditures for research, federal subsidies for medical education and construction, federal support of hospitals and homes for those chronically ill, assistance for better organization of health services through regional co-ordination, and extension of aid for hospital construction.

Seymour E. Harris, Professor of Economics at Harvard University, is the author of Economics of Medicine.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The anticipated costs to the federal government would be about $1 billion, or double the present federal outlays. The cost would be small indeed. For one-third of one percent of the gross national product, the gain in health, in reduced losses of life and days of illness, in higher productivity, would be many times the additional billion dollars involved. To those concerned with budgetary deficits, the answer is that a billion dollars thus wisely spent should yield *at least* $5 to 10 billion in additional income, and hence from $1.5 to 2.5 billion of added taxes.

And there is no sound alternative. On subsidies to health schools for example the Commission is outspoken. The medical schools are in bad shape. They have been hit by inflation and increased real costs of medical education, with relatively fixed revenues. A medical education costs at least $2,500; of which one-quarter is covered by tuition fees. For years the federal government has been urging a federal subsidy; but the AMA has successfully stopped this "nonsense." The AMA minimizes the theory of shortages, despite the fact that there were 176 doctors per 100,000 of population in 1850, 158 in 1900, and 135 in 1950. Graduates were more numerous in 1905 than in 1950, and population has doubled, incomes have quadrupled, and the aging of the population and military demands have further increased the need for medical personnel.

Provision of medical personnel is a crucial problem. There is no use putting more money into medicine, by the method of health insurance, voluntary or compulsory, unless more real resources are made available. These problems have to be met first by financing medical schools adequately. Otherwise more money will merely raise the prices of services, not increase the quantity or quality.

Unless the federal government meets the deficit, the quality of the medical schools' product will deteriorate or health schools will close. Universities can no longer carry these deficits, nor are state governments willing to step in. Private aid, the chimera of the AMA, is not available. After several years of an all-out campaign for medical schools, the Hoover group collected $3 million *in all*. But for 1952-53, only $85 million is available for medical schools. They need another $50 million to cover their requirements.

In its five volumes, the President's Commission makes a contribution to the understanding of the economics of medicine for which all citizens will be grateful. Their failure to make federal-state collaboration on insurance compulsory displeased Walter Reuther and others.

A minority report, signed by Reuther, Elizabeth S. Magee, and A. J. Hayes, charged that the majority recommendations would not accomplish the objectives of the Commission: "that all persons in the country should have ready access to high quality comprehensive personal health service." They argue that any legislation which would leave participation in a health program to the option of each state or which would be dependent upon special kinds of medical organizations would not give "all persons" comprehensive health service. They recommend that participation of every state be assured by federal statute and if such a plan fails, the alternative should be a National Health Insurance Act supported by joint employer-employee contributions and tax revenues.

The Commission deals with almost every conceivable problem. To deal with the problem of chronically ill, the Commission suggests, among other things, multiple screening to detect disease (17 chronic diseases are largely controllable and 27 partially controllable). Periodic examinations for the population are not practical for the medical personnel is not available. Hence the suggestion for multiple screening. The Commission also proposes extension of rehabilitation services and supervised home care, as a means of reducing the burden on the hospitals and yet providing care at minimum expense.

It should be noted that the "Report on Findings and Recommendations" is the first of five volumes to be issued by the Commission. The four others, to be released soon, will detail the nation's health status, the methods of financing a health program and a compilation of the public hearings held by the Commission throughout the country.

The Commission would do well to consider several other possible attacks on financing. One is exemption from income tax of all medical outlays, the proportion to vary inversely with income. Another is the possibility of financing medicine through an income tax, with the government paying all bills to purveyors of services, again with consideration of incomes and minimum payments to be made by the recipient of aid. Yet all in all, the report is excellent. It is reassuring that there are doctors, distinguished in their profession, who look at the problem from the general viewpoint. I think they more nearly reflect the views of all doctors than do those who run some of the medical associations. For many years these men have turned the face of the profession against inevitable progress. And while, from 1929 to 1951, they were fighting "socialized medicine" the cost of government medical services rose from 13 to 23 percent of all medical services in the nation. This shift reflects the unavailability of medical services in present financing, to citizens in need. To the leaders of the profession, as they consider the Commission report, it should stand as a handwriting on the wall.

The Charles C Sigmon Library
EAST TENNESSEE STATE COLLEGE
Johnson City, Tennessee

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LITERATURE AND THE ARTS

THE GRASS ROOTS OF THE ARTIST

by Gerald W. Johnson

CONSIDERING Carl Sandburg's literary stature, if his autobiography—or the first installment of his autobiography—had been less than a great book, that would have been news. But while its quality is instantly apparent, an analysis of that quality is not too easy. The thing is loaded with paradox, with apparent contradiction, with dissonance so swiftly resolved that one is three lines past it before it registers on the mind. Its surface ingenuousness covers some of the most guileful writing of our time.

Carl August Sandburg was the son of Swedish immigrants who married in America and settled in Galesburg, Illinois, where August Sandburg was a blacksmith in the railroad repair shops of the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy. The boy grew up there to the age of 19, then went on the road as a hobo for a year, returned and joined the army at the outbreak of the Spanish-American war, served briefly in Puerto Rico, was brought home and mustered out, then entered Lombard College. There the book ends.

ALWAYS THE YOUNG STRANGERS, by Carl Sandburg (Harcourt, Brace; $5).

That summary suggests a narrative that is of the very essence of the unremarkable, a compendium of the dull, a distillation of the insignificant. And so, in fact, it is; yet it held this ordinarily impatient reader through more than four hundred pages and he laid it down dissatisfied because it ended so soon. Certain it is that there is necromancy here; but how it is worked is known only to the sorcerers' guild.

Part of the spell is Sandburg's uncanny ability to make selective use of the time machine. He knows the trick of rolling back the years emotionally without touching them intellectually. In telling this story he becomes in part but not altogether the young Swedish boy again. He doesn't write like a young Swedish boy, but he feels like one; and this fresh, powerful emotion of youth breaks through the language of the master craftsman, breaks it into startling grammatical and syntactical fragments, often uncouth, sometimes semi-literate.

Yet it cannot master the powerful intelligence developed in later years, so the apparent disorder is always controlled by a larger order and the fragmentation is illusory—every jagged shard falls into a design. The outcome is that we have the story of a nineteenth-century American small town felt by the heart of a young Swedish boy, but seen through the eyes of a master literary craftsman, who is also a poet. Thus it is revealed that what at a glance seems to be an utterly drab background is actually a mixture of every color on the palette, and a tremendous palette, too. It is rich, indescribably rich, yet so completely authentic that anyone who has lived in a small American town, whether in Illinois, or in Georgia, or in Maine, or in any other state will recognize passage after passage as a transcript from his own experience.

This touch of universality reveals the poet, Sandburg, who is not otherwise apparent except now and then through a sudden incandescence in the prose—"her face was a blossom in night rain," "they walked hand in hand and life made rainbows for them," of a Negro cripple "when he smiled or broke into a laugh from his black-skin face it was like promises and flowers." But the Swedish boy was not himself a poet, only the foundation on which in later years a poet was built; and we are here dealing with the Swedish boy.

His outstanding characteristic was abounding health, physical, mental and moral. He lived a hard life but, with few standards of comparison, he didn't realize that it was hard; and in point of fact it wasn't hard, except physically. His father was a stern man, but he loved his children and did his duty by them to the limit of his ability; his mother loved them and wasn't stern. So the boy grew up unwarped and the physical hardships of his youth did no more than make him strong. Without doubt this is the basis of the faith in the future of America that made him predict that in crises "always the young strangers" will come from the end of the street to save the situation.

But one can make no worse mistake than to assume that this is in any sense a literary history. It is hard to imagine a book of less value to a new Hippolyte Taine, interested solely in the means by which a poet learns his craft. Perhaps that will come later; all that this volume asserts is that the discharged soldier who entered Lombard College was not Sandburg, the poet. That character had not yet been born.

This very fact, however, gives the book an intense interest to the reader who is irremediably prosaic; for the fact remains that out of what seemed the most intensely prosaic environment this poet emerged. What happened in Galesburg when Sandburg was a boy happened, with only slight modifications of the extraneous circumstances, in any and every American town of the same period; yet when we see it clearly through the eyes of a great artist we begin to understand that far from being utterly commonplace everything was extraordinary. It asserts that life is miraculous; and surely that assertion is the essence of song.

It is natural, therefore, that critics have described the book as one long poem. But it isn't poetry. It bears the relation to poetry that nacre does to pearl—it is, rather, mother-of-poetry. But for that very reason it may be that it is better adapted to the common uses of life than are the gems too precious for everyday wear.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MOOKSE AND THE GRIPES

HADRIAN THE SEVENTH, by Frederick Baron Corvo (Knopf; $3.50).

FOR NEARLY fifty years now this book has kept its high reputation among people given to literary curiosities. It is a brilliantly circumstantial fantasy about an esthetical and "feline" Englishman whom a deadlock in the College of Cardinals catapults to the Papacy. Until at last he is assassinated by a very unattractive socialist indeed, he passes a lively time rearranging the world into an expanded and improved version of the Holy Roman Empire, installing—naturally—a shower in the Vatican, ordering an epicence crucifix bearing the body of the Apoxyomenos and the head of Antinous, canonizing Dante, exercising with dumbbells, selling off the Vatican treasures to a noble end, rewarding a favorite with the secrets of color photography (1904), outfacing and outwitting blackmailers, and propounding the exorbitantly Rightist opinions of the author.

Twenty or thirty years ago the book could be read tranquilly enough as the private fantasy of its romantically derelict author, and D. H. Lawrence could say " . . . if some of it is caviare, at least it came out of the belly of a live fish." One read it for the sake of that live and queer fish, Frederick Rolfe, alias Frederick Baron Corvo, but one kept it at a much greater distance than Gide's *Les Caves du Vatican*, as less funny and less real. But something, or everything has happened, and Gide has drifted away into his immortality in spite of the Index, while *Hadrian the Seventh* is upon us, bristling with urgency of content. This reissue will probably rate, not as caviare, but as a best-seller. In his introduction to it, Herbert Weinstock says the book's "political tenets can be repulsive when they are not silly", and that they do not matter.

They are repulsive and perhaps silly, but they are, just now, real, in the air and in many minds, and they do matter.

The twentieth century doesn't like the word Autocrat; and pretends that the thing does not exist. But it does: not in the old hereditary form: but Aristos, the Strong Man, invariably dominates. It's in the order of nature. And Demos likes him for it, only the silly thing won't say so.

That, at this date, is not quite all, since Demos has got over much of its reticence. One cannot smile as one did twenty years ago, marking the passage off as the author's eccentricity finding Nietszchean irritability germane. Much of the book is in that vein, fulminating against everything to the Left of Ultraviolet, and it makes exciting contemporary reading.

Corvo appears now a kind of political Jules Verne: his dehumanized geopolitizing, with a stunning apparatus of History, Culture, Race, Religion, Morals, and Science, as reasons, is of the texture of our daily thought. Our sense of Rome, acute as in the days of Hawthorne or of Henry James, can glut itself on these pages which abound in the local color and smell, the prefabricated grandeur and ambivalent putrescence, giving off both an odor of sanctity and the sulphur of diabolism. The Italianate Englishman, proverbially the devil incarnate, is here the Viceregent of Christ, and provides a moral dish to ravish any Puritan palate.

Still Corvo has a saving grace. He knows and says what ails him and/or his hero: lovelessness, fatigue, and a loss of the sense of participation in the world. At times "things lost their significance to him, persons lost their personality, events their importance; and time was not." He says so, but makes of the material nothing like the tragedy (punchiness in the highest places as in the lowest) of which it is capable. That would have taken Tolstoi, or possibly Sartre, who would have made Hadrian less of a projected object and more of an immediate subject, but at least Corvo was not entirely the dupe of his own pathology in his hero. And he had style. His language is often a delicate compound of pedantry and illiteracy, of minute fiddling and outsize flourish, of sentimentality and surgery, but it is constantly fresh, eventful, and savorsome. Crotchety it is, but one never knows what, verbally, is coming next, and that is a great relief from the decently educated and all too consistent and consecutive prose that is now our staple fare. DONALD SUTHERLAND

DICKENS UNDER GLASS

CHARLES DICKENS, by Julian Symons (Roy; $2).

DICKENS AND ELLEN TERNAN, by Ada Nisbet (California; $2.75).

FOR THIS little study of Dickens, Symons chooses an apt and powerful text, one of Kraepelin's descriptions of manic-depression. He takes this tack to get us away from the official "national institution" of the 19th century, the plum pudding, and he certainly gets us closer to the hypnotist, the caricatures that verge into gargoyles, and the almost reckless insight. But Symons is not psychological enough; he seems not to want to see that the out-going problem-solving genius is organic in the same soul as the problematic traits he calls attention to, and partly causes the problems: lesser energies bite off less and make easier adjustments. Like Kraepelin's, his psychology is schematic (traits) rather than dynamic (the human social animal struggling in his society); and he is continually embarrassed to explain positive effects when all he has given is negative causes. Unfortunately he tends to get out of it by denying the positive effects, by trying to show how Dickens fails just where he succeeds.

Symons shows how in Dickens' work there are contrasting strands: the social radical, the comic sentimentalist, the horrifier; but he treats these as "contradictory," rather than showing how they necessitate one another and, being all accepted, drive toward a deeper underlying power. For obviously it is not his disintegrating weaknesses that make a Dickens for us (however they might have played to the social psychoses of his own time); rather, the vision that fused such wildly centrifugal parts into art-works sees deeper than ordinary men. Criticizing a passage, Symons says, "There is too much description of Mr. Pell, and it is too remarkable, for us to assimilate his literal appearance into a world in which appearances and colours are altogether more commonplace than they are in the books of Dickens." Is this indeed the case about the world, or only about our eyes? I am myself a poor observer, but I have a hunch

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that Dickens had a better eyesight for concernful reality than his critic. What I do know is that passages which to Symons are inappropriately comic (e.g. "suddenly getting up, as if he had been waiting in the interval for his legs, and they had just come"), such passages have an exquisite awareness of *exactly* what occurs; they are comic in the way we confused animals are indeed comic.

Curiously (but inevitably), just because he underestimates the reality of Dickens' grotesque view, Symons, also underestimates the glory of his celebration of bourgeois England. For instance, he treats *Pickwick* as a picaresque "too strange for its audience . . . until the sentimental comedy of Sam Weller had been introduced." I think this is to mistake the genre. Is not *Pickwick*, rather, a comic epic and Sam Weller precisely the Sancho Panza who gives the norm against which the bourgeois hero shines grand and absurd? On the premise that the comedy is farce, Symons says, truly, that there isn't enough nearness to the ordinary convention to make it funny, it's all mere fantasy ("Mr. Jingle talks like a madman"). But this comedy is heroic caricature and not humorous as such at all, but marvelous and *objective*. (Mr. Jingle talks like a very bright man in a desperate hurry among folk who are sedate because they have incomes.)

But let me repeat it, this is a good book, subtilely thought and well written, worth disagreeing with.

Ada Nisbet's monograph is a similar effort at "decanonization," as she calls it, by giving documentary proofs that Dickens' affair with the actress Ellen Ternan probably precipitated the breakup of his marriage and that he lived with her afterwards. The author makes use of new material, including infra-red readings of deleted passages, and she establishes her thesis. To my mind, however, she fails to understand what is interesting and significant in the affair, namely Dickens' strange treatment of his wife and his panicky disclaimers and concealments. He accuses her of being demented, he says the children will not approach her, they are "disconcerted:" these look very like simple projections. He cannot tolerate his own excitement after his first beginnings with Ellen; he himself will not touch his wife yet he clings and is resentful; if he tries to move he is overwhelmed with guilt. To go on, he has to build up a new picture for himself and the world, including "rescuing" the children. We do not have a case of mere sham, but of coping with a whole "introjected" morality.

Seeing it this way, we can understand why the Dickensians have fought so bitterly for their domestic idol: it is not that, accepting the facts, they find that an artist happens to have an illicit love-affair; but that if a people's artist like Dickens has an unpredictable spontaneous passion, then the entire structure of society is in question. The religion totters with the saint. The Dickensians take their artist seriously and find they have been seduced to the brink of chaos. And thus, too, we can appreciate, and sympathize with, the heroic effort of the artist himself to ward off the panic and continue the myth.

PAUL GOODMAN

THE MAN IN THE MIDDLE?

SOVIET CIVILIZATION, by Corliss Lamont (Philosophical Library; $5).

I DON'T KNOW how to review this book. I don't even know how to review Corliss Lamont. The author starts with laudable intentions. Most people, he says, are either violently in favor of the Soviet Union, or violently against it. He has tried to be moderate and fair, the man in the middle, hoping thereby to help stem the tide of misunderstanding. It is quite true that he mingles praise and blame in his book; but he does so in terms reminiscent of the old Army joke about the cook who felt it was all right to add horse meat to the rabbit stew since he had preserved reasonable proportions—"one horse and one rabbit."

In the course of his 416 pages Mr. Lamont concedes that the wholesale purges of 1937 were excessive (though the public trials of that year were justified); that expunging Trotsky from the history books was lamentable and ludicrous; that Russia is rather strict toward prisoners, is unfair to pragmatism, should not have attacked Finland, stayed too long in Iran, has overused the veto in the UN, has been harsh to Tito and Anna Louise Strong, and has been laggard on peace treaties with Austria and Germany. He also thinks the Czechoslovak Communists seized power too abruptly, and that the North Koreans should have stopped the war when the UN told them to.

Aside from these points, everything is sweetness and light. He believes Russia wants only peace, is carrying out her Constitution to the letter, and does not dictate to Communists abroad (their following the line is just a coincidence, not to be confused with the coincidence that causes tails to follow kites). The Soviet Union did not help the Chinese Communists to win, is not to blame for Korea, and anyhow the Russian government is not responsible for anything that was done by the Comintern before it was dissolved in 1943 or the Cominform after it was founded in 1945. The reason there are few strikes in Russia is because they are not needed. Russian censorship is no worse than ours, and more candid. Soviet science and culture are wonderful. There is no anti-Semitism in the Communist section of the world (his book went to press before the recent Prague trials, with their anti-Semitic overtones). Nobody any longer talks the old nonsense that dying capitalism will collapse into war (his book was presumably on the press when Stalin, on October 2, 1952, did exactly that).

The author is much better when he talks about the sins of Western Europe and America. He has good material about how Britain and France, with American help, did the League of Nations to death in the 1930s, and on the shocking jingoistic talk that goes on in America today. Most of his indictment is true, though he leaves unanswered the stubborn question: if the West is so bad, and the Soviet Union such a paradise, why is it necessary to lock the doors of paradise to keep the paradisians from escaping?

Mr. Lamont has been to Soviet Russia twice, and I have only been once, which doubtless entitles him to be twice as gullible as I am—but my guess is, not gullible enough. I predict that the wrist taps he gives the Soviet Union, listed

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

above, will be sufficient to make him persona non grata, however useful he may otherwise be as the prosperous American friend who even wears his rose-tinted spectacles to bed. Perhaps he may wind up as the man in the middle, after all. BRUCE BLIVEN

THE ROOT SYSTEM

THE FAITH OF OUR FATHERS, edited by Irving Mark and Eugene L. Schwab (Knopf; $5).

THE AMERICAN faith is usually presented in the words of famous leaders. Instead, the editors of this volume have searched the minds and hearts of great people of little renown. Among the authors of 124 speeches, articles, resolutions and notes, subdivided to cover a dozen aspects of American struggle and aspiration, one finds nobody above the office-holding fame of two or three forgotten cabinet members. The effect is to carry the American faith to its roots and give it a deeper validity than the most noted political philosophers could impart.

As an example, consider the meaning of our republican form of government, guaranteed by the Constitution. In *The Federalist*, this is defined as representative government based on "the great body of the people." Extensive disfranchisement would subvert it into the aristocratic form. Was that a closet utterance or the general American doctrine? In this anthology, a similar concept of republican government is found in an anonymous 1801 address to the people of Richmond, an 1819 Richmond memorial, an 1829 resolution of Pennsylvania workingmen; speeches by Samuel Whitcomb Jr. in 1833, William Leggett in 1836, Henry E. Riell in 1840; an 1841 book by George Sidney Camp; a speech by Thomas Dorr (convicted of treason and released by the force of public opinion) in 1842; resolutions of a women's rights convention in 1848; a sermon by Theodore Parker in 1850; an 1851 speech on Negro suffrage by Norton S. Townshend.

Of these, only Parker is known to fame, and few people would think first of him on reading his 1850 definition of democracy as "a government of all, for all, by all." Of necessity, a "common man" anthology of the American faith is replete with the names and utterances of martyrs—Lovejoy and John Brown, whose souls are now marching in lockstep, and a host of men and women who faced mobs or felt the social lash. These are the people who defended the victims of society or who rose from the ranks of human slavery or labor oppression to assert their rights as men. One might wish that the editors had mentioned the fate that befell George Logan, who is included for his protests against laws favoring the concentration of wealth. The introductory note identifies him as the man whose private "peace mission" to France in 1798 caused Congress to pass the famous (or infamous) "Logan Act" making such actions criminal. Reference to that law should always include the punishment Logan actually received after it was passed. Pennsylvania sent him to the United States Senate.

From this anthology one can learn (though it is not pointed out) that denials of freedom of speech are most severe when freedom acutely touches the pocket nerve. Thomas Skidmore, a New York mechanic, met with no interference in 1829 when he attacked property rights in a way that might have caused his indictment for criminal syndicalism a century later. But when abolitionists spoke their minds about slavery, mobs broke up meetings, burned meeting halls and newspaper offices and murdered editors.

Mark and Schwab have made it clear, through the words of little-known men and women, that between 1790 and 1860 the everlasting forces of repression were met with a flaming spirit born of the American Revolution. The United States was a turbulent place. Liberty had enemies who in the mass seemed stronger than its defenders. But those enemies were challenged by people who knew the meaning of the Declaration of Independence and were unafraid. We are left to wonder not only whether that spirit still lives, but whether the mass of the people are not too remote from the origin of their rights to know what they really mean. IRVING BRANT

WITH LITTLE SYNTHESIS

ART, FORM AND CIVILIZATION, by Ernest Mundt (California; $3.75).

THE MOST IMPRESSIVE portion of Mr. Mundt's book is the title. It promises all kinds of satisfactions; but what follows is disappointingly slim. This lack probably arises from Mr. Mundt's fundamental indecision as to both the tone and the subject of his book. As I understand it, he has written an inspirational tract, supported by some philosophical analysis and illustrated by examples from the history of artistic forms. The result does not come off. *Art, Form and Civilization* is too muted to be very inspiring and too casual in its analysis of several traditionally knotty philosophical problems to contribute much to our understanding Furthermore the sections of the book which treat of the relations between forms and civilizations are so arbitrarily presented and scantily developed as to be of little use to anyone who has given the first thought to the question of why the art of one period differs from that of another.

The inspirational intent of Mr. Mundt's argument can be clearly seen in his longing for that queer creature who creeps through much of modern thought under various disguises. In this case he is called unitary man, alias the well-integrated personality. This rarity, "through harmonious interaction of his senses, his feelings, his intuition and his reason relates himself to his fellow men, to nature and to God." Although unitary man is clearly a more endearing fellow than his freakish brothers, economic man (all stomach), rational man (all brain) and political man (all hands and mouth), he is, we must remember, an abstraction like the rest of them. Mr. Mundt, in his enthusiasm, sometimes forgets this.

Although contemporary literature is filled with theories as to why fragmentary man is such a mess, Mr. Mundt chooses one which is peculiarly suited to his inspirational purpose. With little analytical cogency, he amplifies Sir Arthur Eddington's familiar distinction between symbolic and intimate knowledge into the more extreme opposition between scientific and mystical knowl-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

edge. This bifurcation is the cause of our troubles, which have been further aggravated, as we might expect, by the excessive importance which has been accorded science as a method for gaining knowledge of the world.

What is needed? A synthesis, of course. How can we achieve this synthesis? Through art. And how shall we approach art? Through participation. Faced with the complex problems which are raised when we investigate the nature of art, Mr. Mundt begs the question by calling art a unitary process—fit food for unitary man. In his words: "Since art addresses the whole man, a work of art must constitute a whole."

This quotation exemplifies the weaknesses of this book. Yet the author is well intentioned and shares an agreeable message. He invites us to live in peace with ourselves and our neighbors, to fill our lives with rich experience and deep communal meanings. He believes that Art will help us achieve this.

KERMIT LANSNER

SOUTHERN SUFFRAGE

PRIMARY ELECTIONS IN THE SOUTH, by Cortez Ewing (Oklahoma; $2.75).

PROFESSOR EWING sets out "to examine the primary systems of the South and to determine, if possible, whether the intra-party struggle produces results that are not at variance with the demands of democratic procedure." In this endeavor he collected data on 3,843 primary nominations in eleven states and put the facts about each on a punch-card.

The object then became to determine, by shuffling the cards, the number of candidates for nomination (in different states, under different party systems, for different types of office), the proportions of nominations unopposed, the effects of the candidacy of an incumbent for re-nomination, the closeness of the voting in the primary, and the function of the runoff primary (the second polling under a double primary system in which the two high candidates at the first primary make a "runoff" race). The number of candidates for Democratic nominations in contested races was slightly higher in single-primary contests than in double-primary contests (3.63 against 3.26). Statewide administrative offices were on the average sought by the largest number of aspirants; judicial nominations, by the fewest. Of the single primary nominations, 42.6 percent were uncontested; of the double-primary nominations, 32.7 percent. Yet the conclusion that the runoff system will "produce more uncontested nominations than the single primary" is somewhat dubious, for the author seems unaware that factors other than nominating procedure may not remain "equal" in his comparisons.

When an incumbent was a candidate for re-nomination, the average number of candidates was less than when the field was wide-open. Incumbents were singularly successful in gaining re-nomination and were more successful under the double than the single primary system. Of the 3,843 nominations, 40 percent were uncontested; about a third of the winners of contested nominations had a plurality of 10 percent or less of the total vote. Of the nominations under the double-primary system, 84.2 percent were made in the first primary; in the remaining cases about three out of four leaders in the first primary won the nomination in the runoff. Voter participation in Southern Democratic primaries, where the real choices are made, was far lower than in the general election in other sections of the country.

What most of this has to do with the compatibility of the results of the Southern primary system with "the demands of democratic procedure" is not immediately apparent. Nor does the author clear up the question of the relevance of the data to his main problem, although he indicates that his materials would probably take on more meaning by comparison with the record of two-party states. For the student of the technical aspects of the primary, the book brings together some useful facts. The main moral of the book, however, is that an IBM sorter is not a thinking machine. It produces findings no more significant than the questions fed into it. From the 36 tables in the 106 pages of this book one must conclude that no question of much significance went into this machine.

V. O. KEY JR.

ON ACTING

by Eric Bentley

TRYING, some time ago, to discover how Shakespeare was acted in his own time, I found that scholars classify acting as either *natural* or *artificial* and put Shakespeare into whichever category they prefer: Shakespeare's own principal utterance on the subject—Hamlet's advice to the players—lends itself equally well to either interpretation! Though my first impulse was to reject these categories altogether, I soon caught myself reintroducing them in disguise: *natural* reappeared as *realistic*, *artificial* reappeared as *stylized* when I disliked it and as *the grand manner* when I approved. And looking back over the history of theatre, I realized that critics have fallen into but two classes: those who say acting has become so natural it lacks beauty and those who say it has become so fancy it lacks naturalness. The critic's plea is either for a return to the grand manner or for a return to reality. But this is not to say that we all stand either for one style or the other, simple or grand, natural or artificial. On the contrary, so soon as we think about it, we recognize that dramatic art necessarily involves both imitation and selection, nature and artifice, truth and beauty. We want the right balance, so we put our own weight on the side which contemporary theatre is neglecting. (Cibber's defense of the "natural" Betterton reads: "But alas! to preserve this medium, between mouthing, and meaning too little . . . is of all the Master-strokes of an Actor the most difficult to reach.") To interpret Hamlet's advice correctly we would need to know whether Shakespeare's contemporaries were leaning too far toward the natural or toward the artificial; Hamlet was against the unbalance, whichever it was. *Natural* and *artificial* are not names of rival styles in acting; they are names for lack of style in acting. Acting is both natural and artificial, yet to the extent that it comes off, to the extent that it is *good* acting, it is not notably either. At this point, we seek more laudatory words. We replace *naturalness* with *reality*, *artifice* with *style*, nor would we grant that a performance had *reality* till we felt it had *style*, or *style* till we felt it had

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

reality. Hence, though we can divide bad actors into two widely different schools—natural and artificial—we shall find that good actors have a great deal in common with each other. We must not be misled at finding a great actor of the past assigned by critics to the natural or to the artificial category. This, if it means anything, and if the actor was really great, means that he corrected the balance, was *natural* in counteracting excessive artificiality, or *artificial* in counteracting excessive naturalness. The terms are relative. Forbes Robertson is often cited in pleas for the grand manner; he has also been called the most natural of actors. Much the same is true of Duse. Henry Irving has become a byword for rant and artifice, yet he shocked his Victorian public with his harsh, abrupt "realism." Bretton and Garrick were congratulated on their naturalness, but just compare their portraits with performances by any actor of our current nose-picking school! To say that their naturalness had its limits is only to reiterate that they were actors.

Have good actors so much in common that we should not readily notice stylistic differences between them? Differences that can partly be described by words like *natural* and *artificial?* These are rhetorical questions, and I agree with the implied answer but think it less important than the fact that even the minimum requirements of good acting are so considerable that Burbadge, Betterton, Garrick, Kean, and Forbes Robertson *must* have more in common with each other than any one of them has with a defective, one-sided actor, natural or artificial. When a critic contrasts one actor's style with another's he is almost invariably saying that one is right, the other wrong, one a good actor, the other a bad. Thus, Leigh Hunt does not present Kemble and Kean as great actors who have little in common; he is telling us that Kemble is not great. So with Shaw on Bernhardt and Duse; he finds Bernhardt's acting faulty; those who think him prejudiced in favor of Duse's greater naturalness should read his good-humored demolition of one of the better natural actors of the time, John Hart. If you grant that good acting is neither "natural" nor "artificial" you will not find it very profitable to describe one good actor as "more natural" or "more artificial" than another: this will only be to say that good actors are not wholly good. Again, if you compare the relative "naturalness" of 18th and 20th century acting, you will have to discuss what the two periods consider natural. Which in turn involves what *is* natural in the two periods. And naturalness is relative to place as well as time: a gesture that is natural to an Italian is unnatural to an Englishman. In short, though the word *natural* may lead us into interesting speculations, it leads away from the subject of acting; it is not a convenience but a distraction.

It follows that the same is true of *artificial*, its antithesis. In a given period, the tendency of bad acting (thus of the acting profession as a whole) is "natural" or "artificial"; and the critic will be busy deploring the tendency. As for good acting, its being both or neither forces the critic, if he is to come to grips with it at all, to more specific description. For, though in transcending the natural and artificial, good actors have a technique in common, what interests us is what they do with their technique. Having come out into the clear, where do they go? Classifications a good deal more helpful than natural and artificial are no doubt possible. But more interesting for the student of theatre than the generalities are the particulars. For once an actor has his technique (i.e., *is* an actor), his individuality shows itself. He has shed everything that passed for his personality in the days when personality meant the part of him that was accessible to his conscious mind and to the minds of fans and publicity men. He now has his personality as an artist. The one *persona* is an obstacle, the other an instrument. The critic, for his part, if he has put bad acting in its place, and knows a false *persona* when he sees it, is free to forget about styles and talk of actors' personalities. The best recorded writing about acting is sheer description of performance and amounts in each case—I am thinking of certain pages in Cibber and Lichtenberg, Hazlitt and Montague—to a portrait of the actor.

HOW TO GET YOUR BOOK PUBLISHED

Do you have a book-length manuscript you want published? Learn about our unusual plan whereby your book can be published, promoted and distributed on a professional basis. We consider all types of work—fiction, non-fiction, poetry, religious and scholarly books, etc. For more information, write for booklet RP. It's free.

Vantage Press, Inc., 120 W. 31st St., N.Y. 1

In Calif.: 6356 Hollywood Blvd., Hollywood 28.

LITERARY SERVICES

WRITERS! TV MINDED? You do not have to be a television writer to write for TV. Outline, synopsis, plot, etc., will suffice. MEAD LITERARY AGENCY, 419 Fourth Avenue, New York 16.

HAVE YOU SOMETHING TO SAY? Perhaps we can publish your book. We emphasize creative editing and re-writing of worth-while nonfiction. Send manuscript for details of corporative publishing plan. Trend Publishers, Box B, 41 West 33rd Street, New York City.

SPECIAL ACCOMMODATIONS

Genteel, middle-aged woman desires room (preferably private bath) and board for about six months with intelligent, congenial people in the Fairfield County section of Connecticut. Address: Box 10, The New Republic.

PEP
Pamphlets

● Single copies of the broadsheets issued by Political and Economic Planning (London) may still be purchased from the New Republic for 25c cash postpaid. The most recent issues are:

#332 The Sterling Area—I
#332 The Sterling Area—II
#333 Land-Use Planning
#334 The Control of Investment
#335 The Gramophone Record
#336 The Prospects
#337 Home Ownership
#338 The Future of Leasehold
#339 Exports—A Longer View.
#340 The World's Food
#341 Film Business
#342 France—Some Economic Factors
#343 Colonial Development
#344 Poverty
#345 France—Reconstruction & Investment
#346 Technical Assistance I—Agencies and Programmes
#347 Technical Assistance II—Policy and Method
#348 New Thinking on Monopoly
#349 Social Security and Unemployment in Lancashire

Price 25¢—Order from

The New Republic

40 EAST 49 STREET New York 17, N. Y.

PRINTED BY NATIONAL PUBLISHING CO., 301 N. ST., N. E., WASHINGTON 2, D. C.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

50% Gain in Readership

In the past six-month period the circulation of the *New Republic* has increased by 50%.

While much of this gain is in the form of short-term gift subscriptions, it is doubtful if any long-established magazine ever before scored an increase of such magnitude in so brief a period.

What is most encouraging is that substantial gains were recorded also in regular long-term subscriptions, in newsstand sales and, best of all, many of the short-terms are already renewing for a full year or for two years.

Yet the *New Republic* still needs many more thousands of new readers to help it wage the kind of battle expected of it as a spokesman for the Stevenson spirit and representative of the unrepresented millions who look forward to Great Tomorrows.

The *New Republic* does not enjoy, and the experience of almost forty years suggests it never will enjoy, the subsidy of commercial advertising that so largely supports the one-party press. It is dependent on its readers for the revenue it needs to continue publishing.

Throughout 1953 please back the magazine which is yours. Edited in Washington, next door to the Capitol and White House, it is close to the centers of vital news and decisions. It will not oppose the incoming administration out of partisanship, but the editors will strive always to keep the Stevenson spirit fresh in memory and to carry forward his kind of discussion of public questions.

The *New Republic* does more than report and inform—it provides a link and a bond between like-minded people everywhere who find their newspapers and commentators biased and inadequate.

Below is an order blank. Please send as many gift 13-week subscriptions as you can to start the New Year. For only $1.00 each, you can introduce your friends to the *New Republic*.

----------TEAR OFF HERE----------

13 WEEKS FOR $1.00 SPECIAL OFFER

THE NEW REPUBLIC
40 EAST 49TH STREET, NEW YORK 17, N. Y.

For the enclosed $..... please send the New Republic for the next 13 weeks to the following:

NAME..... NAME.....

ADDRESS..... ADDRESS.....

CITY & ZONE.....STATE..... CITY & ZONE.....STATE.....

NAME..... NAME.....

ADDRESS..... ADDRESS.....

CITY & ZONE.....STATE..... CITY & ZONE.....STATE.....

The Charles C. Sherrod Library
1949-53
EAST TENNESSEE STATE COLLEGE
Johnson City, Tennessee

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED